

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application.

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's acceptance of the drawings filed on September 20, 2001. Claims 1-25 are pending in the application.

The Office Action indicates a rejection of Claims 1-10 and 17-22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Parasnus (U.S. Patent No. 6,728,753 B1); a rejection of Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Parasnus (U.S. Patent No. 6,728,753 B1) in view of Karam ("Visualization Using Timelines"); a rejection of Claims 12-15 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Parasnus in view of Uchihashi ("Video Manga: Generating Semantically Meaningful Video Summaries"); and a rejection of Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Parasnus (U.S. Patent No. 6,728,753 B1) in view of Uchihashi and Lin (U.S. Patent No. 5,978,818); and a rejection of Claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Parasnus (U.S. Patent No. 6,728,753 B1) in view of Fujiko (U.S. Patent 5,414,481); and a rejection of Claim 25 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Parasnus (U.S. Patent No. 6,728,753 B1) in view of Uchihashi and Karam. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants invention differs from the applied prior art. Figure 6 depicts the steps used in the method consistent with the claimed embodiments for capturing a lecture. The disclosed system is for use in capturing a live presentation for broadcast or other reviewing via a recording medium for remote viewers. Such live presentations are given in conference rooms, auditoriums or the like, and usually have a person or presenter who is providing information and using slides as a visual

and that are presented to the audience attending the presentation. Slides can be captured and formatted for streaming to remote users via the Internet. The apparatus and steps for capturing the live presentation and processing the captured presentation for use by others are broadcast over a network are encompassed by the claims 1-25.

Figure 6 illustrates, in step 600, the slide media being prepared by the presenter. The slide media can be 35-mm slides, a computer-generated presentation, overhead transparency or paper documents, and is referred to as the projected media and slides in the claims. With regard to step 602 of Figure 6, the lecture-capture mode is selected and several steps as described of Applicants specification are shown. At step 604, the first slide is captured using, for instance, a mirror assembly 204.

In the embodiment utilizing the mirror assembly 204, the mirror assembly 204 flips to divert the light path from the projector to the CCD 206 of the digital camera. The digital image of the captured slide is stored in an image format such as JPEG. After capturing the image by the CCD 206, the mirror assembly 204 flips back to allow the light path to project onto the projection screen 114. At steps 606 and 608, a timer is started with the projection of the first slide and audio recording begins. Once the presenter is done explaining the subject matter of the slide, the next slide is presented (step 610) and, as described at page 16, lines 1-10 Applicant's specification, the mirror assembly 204 is used to capture a new slide in JPEG format and stored it in a electronic folder. The time of the slide change is recorded (step 612). When the new slide is captured, the mirror assembly 204 quickly diverts the light from the slide image back to the projection screen 114 (step 616). Any

additional slides to be presented are handled in a similar manner. This is only one embodiment of the claimed capturing means, other embodiments are disclosed in paragraphs [0110] - [0156].

Parasnus discloses broadcasting a live presentation from a presentation broadcast source to a number of receiving computers linked in communication with the presentation broadcast source across a computer network. The live presentation disclosed by Parasnus includes a predefined content portion. The predefined content portion comprises a number of presentation slides that are shown in response to slide triggered events during the live presentation (Parasnus column 4, lines 5-8).

The Office Action cites column 4, lines 1-11 of Parasnus as disclosing the claimed feature of "capturing during the live presentation electronic still images for display". However, the cited section of Parasnus discloses that the live presentation includes a *predefined* content portion comprising a plurality of presentation slides. The cited section does not disclose the claimed capturing feature. Instead at column 4, lines 20-27, Parasnus states that the data corresponding to the plurality of presentation slides are saved to one or more HTML files which are broadcast prior to the start of the presentation so that the data may be cached at the receiving computer. Numerous other portions of Parasnus, for instance, column 20, lines 37-48, column 21, lines 33-39, column 22, lines 27-32, also disclose the live presentation as including a predefined content portion, including a number of presentation slides.

The Office asserts that the presentation slides of Parasnus are analogous to the electronic still images that are captured by the claimed means for capturing. However, both the Office Action and Parasnus refer to the displayed slides as being

the predefined content, which Parasnis discloses is being broadcast prior to the presentation. Therefore, Parasnis does not need to capture during the live presentation electronic still images for display.

Parasnus discloses directing a video camera at the presenter 1150 and/or projection screen 1158 (column 19, lines 64-66). This also would not meet all of the features recited in the independent claims. For instance, even if one were to assume *arguendo* that slide 1198 of Fig. 10 of Parasnis was those captured from the projection screen, it would not be necessary nor would it be suggested to synchronize change over from one electronic still image to another with the audio recording as recited in claim 1 because the audio is simultaneously obtained with the video captured by the video camera. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Parasnis does not disclose or suggest at least synchronizing change over from one electronic still image to another with the audio recording as recited in claim 1. This is particularly true since Parasnis discloses using streaming video to present the audio/video content separate from the HTML presentation slides (column 23, lines 58-63).

Even assuming, *arguendo*, that a view of the presentation screen was sent to a receiving computer (which is not actually stated in Parasnis), Parasnis does not disclose or suggest the view of the projection screen would be used in combination with the presentation slides that were provided prior to the presentation as predefined content. This suggests that views of the presentation screen are not captured during the lecture.

With regard to the Office's comments regarding a rebuttal of Applicant's arguments regarding claim 24, again Parasnis discloses an HTML script command

to control the display of predefined content. In other words, it is a command signal to display the slides of the previously stored HTML file that is sent, it is not a signal to "capture" image data. The slides in the HTML file are not captured when displayed because they have been previously created using a software application such as PowerPoint for display to a user. Parasnus does not disclose or suggest automatically capturing still image data from an image in response to an initiation and audio data associated with the display of the image. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider the claims based on the above and provide an indication that the claims are allowable over the applied prior art.

The same basic arguments apply to independent Claim 20, which recites *inter alia* "a capturing component configured to capture digital still images data from data used to generate the still image, while the still image is being displayed by the still image generator."

As for the rejection of claim 24, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the Office Action cites column 4, lines 1-34, of Parasnus as disclosing automatically capturing still image data from the image in response to the initiation and audio data associated with the display of the image. However, column 4, lines 1-34, disclose the predefined content being provided to a remote viewer and not the automatically capturing still image data, nor capturing audio data associated with the display of the image. Also cited from Parasnus is column 20, lines 4-22, however, that citation refers to video data captured by video camera 1160 in video capture card 1162. The cited passage from Parasnus does not disclose automatically capturing still image data from the image in response to the initiation.

As for the Uchihashi reference, it does not cure the deficiencies of the Parasnus reference nor does the Office suggest it does. Accordingly, neither the Parasnus nor the Uchihashi reference, individually or in combination, disclose the feature of automatically capturing still image data, who's display was initiated, from the image in response to the initiation and audio data associated with the display of the image as recited in claim 24. Instead, Uchihashi is applied for allegedly teaching the storage of images in a data base, creating a searchable transcript, OCR and text summarization functions.

The other secondary references also do not supply the teachings missing from Parasnus. Karam is cited for allegedly teaching determining the location of a pointer in association with a timestamp, etc. Lin is cited for allegedly teaching an auto outlining function, and Fukioka is cited for allegedly teaching a paper document projector. First, the alleged motivations for combination are contested since the Office has not cited prior art in support thereof. Second, even if there was a motivation to combine, the hypothetical result would not meet the recitations of the claims for the reasons given above.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application, or should the Examiner believe a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application, the undersigned respectfully requests that he be contacted at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC

Date: June 9, 2006 By: 
Charles F. Wieland III
Registration No. 33,096

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620